

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/561,620	Applicant(s) MEISEL ET AL.	
	Examiner JACOB T. MINSKEY	Art Unit 1791	

All Participants:

(1) JACOB T. MINSKEY.

(2) Ian Lodovice.

Date of Interview: 11 December 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
NA

Claims discussed:
10-15

Prior art documents discussed:
NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Eric Hug/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 12:00

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
The interview was to discuss the patentability of the product claims and how the novel feature of the process was the act of using the specific silica sol in the aqueous portion of paper making. It was discussed that the product claims read on a variety of known silica sols, but the product claims that specify the intended use is novel. It was discussed to cancel the product and product by process claims in order to proceed with the allowance of the process claims.